

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on March 18, 2011. Claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13, and 15-17 were previously considered for examination. Per the received amendment, claim 18 was added.
2. Claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13, and 15-18 are currently pending consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on March 18, 2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

The Applicant argues that the Cited Prior Art (CPA) does not teach that the second input-output means is separate from the first input-output means. This argument is not found persuasive. The claim does not state whether the second input/output means is physically separate from the first input/output means and therefore, could be logically separate. The first input-output means is a smart card interface (column 3, lines 51-55). The second input-output means is interpreted as one of the other smart card interfaces which receives the MAC (preliminary data) and uses it to determine if the card is authentic, and based on that allows or disallows the complete transfer of data if the data is not authentic (Lee: column 7, lines 17-34).

Furthermore, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not teach microcircuit cards. This argument is also not found persuasive. The CPA teaches a plurality of smart card (microcircuit card) interfaces (column 3, lines 53-57). Furthermore, the CPA

teaches that preliminary data is provided to the card via an interface which is interpreted as the second input-output means (column 7, lines 17-34). Therefore, the CPA does teach the interfaces are within a microcircuit card. Alternatively, the Applicant does not define what a microcircuit card is meant to be, and therefore, an interface card on a host can be read to include a "microcircuit card."

Furthermore, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not disclose stream control means to control the transfer of data. This argument is not found persuasive. Pyle discloses DMA circuitry which stores bits and then forwards data (Pyle: column 4, lines 1-22). This storing and forwarding is analogous to controlling the transfer of digital data and therefore the argument is not found persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (U.S. Patent 5,923,759).

Regarding claim 16, Lee discloses:

first input-output means for receiving digital data (column 3, lines 51-59);
processing means for processing said digital data (column 3, lines 51-59);
transfer means for transferring said digital data between the first input-output means and a storage area (column 7, lines 18-34);
second input-output means for receiving preliminary data, wherein the second input-output means is separate from the first input-output means (column 7, lines 17-23).;
stream control means adapted to control the transfer of digital data taking into account the preliminary data (column 7, lines 17-34: *change switch between algorithms*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 6, 8, 11-13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent 5,923,759) in view of Pyle et al. (U.S. Patent 5,737,231).

Claim 3 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 16, characterized in that said security data (DATA_CTRL) includes authentication data (AUTH) for authenticating a portion (P1) of the digital data received by the card, the stream control means (26) being adapted to verify the validity of said digital data (DATA) on the basis of this authentication data (AUTH) and to control said transfer as a function of the result of this verification (column 7, lines 17-23).

Claim 6 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 16, characterized in that the stream control means are adapted to modify at least one operating parameter of said transfer means (DMA) (column 7, lines 17-34: *change switch between algorithms*).

Claim 8 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 16, characterized in that said processing means (12) include a data compression unit (13), a data decompression unit, a data encryption unit or a data decryption unit (column 1, lines 1-15).

Claim 11 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 10, characterized in that said preliminary data includes authentication data (PASSWD) (column 7, lines 51-60: *PIN*).

Claim 12 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 10, characterized in that said data includes a storage address for said digital data (column 7, lines 23-24).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 1, characterized in that it further includes regulation means (PLL) adapted to modify a clock frequency applied to the processing means (12) as a function of said security data (DATA_CTRL) (column 6, lines 20-25: *switching between synchronous and asynchronous clocks*).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 11. Furthermore, Lee discloses:

Microcircuit card according to claim 11, characterized in that said data includes a storage address for said digital data (column 7, lines 17-23).

Claim 17 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 16. Lee does not explicitly disclose that the transfer means include a DMA component. Pyle discloses a DMA controller that automatically transfers network frame data between the network controller and buffers in host system memory (Pyle: column 10, lines 4-22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the DMA controller of Pyle in the system of Lee to allow multiple data transfers from a single fixed memory location or from sequential memory locations to the same number of sequential memory locations (Pyle: column 10, lines 4-22).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent 5,923,759) in view of Pyle et al. (U.S. Patent 5,737,231) in further in view of Perron (U.S. Patent Pub. No. U.S. 2002/0060249).

Lee and Pyle do not explicitly state that the second input-output means is an ISO 7816 interface. Perron, in an analogous art, discloses the use of an ISO 7816 interface (Perron: paragraph 0007). Perron discloses that such an interface is used to receive both a clock signal and to receive the power (Perron: paragraph 0007). It would have been obvious to use the ISO 7816 interface of Perron in the system of Lee-Pyle so that the card would not require an internal power source and an internal clock (Perron: paragraph 0007).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KAVEH ABRISHAMKAR whose telephone number is (571)272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kaveh Abrishamkar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431

/K. A./
05/21/2011
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2431